



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/972,284	10/05/2001	Kendell A. Chilton	EMC01-31(01129)	4870	
7590 06/07/2005			EXAMINER		
David E. Huang, Esq.			HUISMAN, DAVID J		
CHAPIN & HU	ANG, L.L.C.				
Westborough Office Park			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
1700 West Park Drive			2183		
Westborough, MA 01581			DATE MAILED: 06/07/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/972,284	CHILTON, KENDELL A.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
David J. Huisman	2183	

	David J. Mulsinali	2103					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>23 May 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follo places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No. (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in completely following time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice o wing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	of Appeal. To avoid ab affidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (	ence, which CFR 41.31; or				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing d b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b).  MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)		IKST KEPLT WAS FILE	טעיו אווחוועע כ				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on peen filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nd the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in composition of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)	), to avoid dismissal (	of the appeal.				
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,  (a) They raise new issues that would require further co  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bel  appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a	nsideration and/or search (see NC w); tter form for appeal by materially r corresponding number of finally re	TE below); educing or simplifying					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a	21. See attached Notice of Non-C ):	·					
the non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-30, as set forth in the final rejection</u> .  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			·				
B.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affida	evit or other evidence	is necessary				
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apper y and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a (1).				
IO. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attac	cnea.				
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered busee attached sheet.	at does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	ince because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)					
			,				

Applicant argues the rejection of claim 1, on pages 17-18 of the remarks, in suchstance that:

"Sharangpani still does not disclose performing a series of operations in accordance with the identified series of individual instructions, as recited in claim 1. Clearly, the standard and irrebuttable meaning of the word "series" is "a group of things (e.g., operations) of the same class coming one after the other in succession" (emphasis added; see The American Heritage Dictionary, Second Edition, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1991). Accordingly, performing a series of operations in accordance with an identified series of individual instructions clearly means performing operations one after the other in succession (based on the series of individual instructions parsed from the payload of the script command communication)."

Although fully considered, the examiner finds this argument to be non-persuasive for the following reasons:

Even when using applicant's definition of "series", the examiner believes that Sharangpani still anticipates applicant's claim1. Looking at Fig.2, the instructions of slots 0, 1, and 2 make up a group of operations and one instruction succeeds another instruction. More specifically, the slot 2 instruction follows the slot 1 instruction which, in turn, follows the slot 0 instruction. Sharangpani also discloses that execution order within a bundle is from left to right. See column 8, lines 60-61. Consequently, the examiner asserts that operations within a given bundle qualify as a series of operations as they are a group and one comes after the other in succession. Furthermore, it appears that applicant is arguing that Sharangpani does not teach serial execution (as opposed to a series of operations), which is a limitation that is not found in the claims.

EDDIE CHAN

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100